

**APPROVED JULY 2, 2015**

The regular meeting of the Douglas County Board of Commissioners was held on June 4, 2015 in the Douglas County Commissioner Meeting Room of the Douglas County Administration Building, 1616-8<sup>th</sup> Street, Minden, Nevada, beginning at 1:00 p.m.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Doug N. Johnson, Chairman; Nancy McDermid, Vice Chairwoman; Greg Lynn, Commissioner; Barry Penzel, Commissioner and Steve Thaler, Commissioner.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jim Nichols, County Manager; Doug Ritchie, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney; Cynthia Gregory, Deputy District Attorney; District Chief Tod Carlini, EFFD; Carl Ruschmeyer, Public Works Director; Jon Erb, Civil Engineer III; Chief David Fogerson, EFFD; Mimi Moss, Community Development Director; Hope Sullivan, Planning Manager; Emery Papp, Senior Planner; and Laure Penny, Clerk to the Board.

**INVOCATION**

The Invocation was led by Rajan Zed, Universal Society of Hinduism.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Greg Lynn led the Pledge of Allegiance

**PUBLIC COMMENT (No Action)**

Carlo Luri updated the Board on the status of the Bently Heritage Estate Distillery. They are expecting demolition on the non-historic buildings to start in mid-June. They are working with NV Energy on permits to underground the power lines at the site.

Lynn Muzzy would like the Board to explore a Johnson Lane GID.

Marie Schnock wanted to let everybody know about a Health and Wellness Symposium that was held on May 21 and how they used members of the community to help with many issues such as nutrition; seniors and veterans; family resiliency; mental health & youth; financing; transportation and how to reach out to the people that need services. They found we have a great deal of expertise in the community that can be tapped into.

Jim Slade stated he believed the 4 Planning Commissioners who voted in favor of the Greenstone Renewables Project did not adequately address the 8 Findings that were needed to approve the project. Mr. Slade felt the Commissioners were more

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

concerned about property rights than the required Findings. He urged the Board to approve the appeal of the Planning Commission.

Public comment closed.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**For possible action. Approval of proposed agenda.**

MOTION by Lynn/McDermid to approve the agenda; carried unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

**For possible action. Approval of the Board Minutes of:**

MOTION by McDermid/Penzel to approve the Minutes for May 7, 2015 – Regular Meeting and May 18, 2015 - Special Meeting; carried unanimously

**DOUGLAS COUNTY AWARD PRESENTATIONS**

**1. Ceremonial presentation of employee service award to Agorastos from EFFPD for his 20 years of dedicated service.**

Vice Chairman McDermid reads the service award into the record.

Mr. Agorastos stated it's been great working with some of the most dedicated, highly trained individuals around.

Tod Carlini, Fire Chief for EFFD, stated it's been fantastic having Mr. Agorastos working for East Fork Fire. He currently serves in the training and safety assignment as a Captain and he does an incredible job.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

MOTION by McDermid/Lynn to approve the Consent Calendar items 2a-2q.

**FINANCE**

**2a. For possible action. Discussion on approval of the deletion of certain assets from the Douglas County Capital Asset Inventory as presented. (Christine Vuletich)**

MOTION to approve;

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

**2b. For possible action. Discussion on adoption of Resolution 2015R-047 amending Resolution 2014R-071 establishing an updated list of petty cash funds for departments of Douglas County. (Christine Vuletich)**

MOTION to approve;

**CLERK-TREASURER**

**2c. For possible action. Discussion to approve receipt and filing of Cumulative Voucher Sheets for checks issued for the 04/10/2015 Payables, the 04/14/2015 Payables, the 04/17/2015 Payables, the 04/17/2015 Payroll, the 04/20/2015 Payables, the 4/24/2015 Payables, the 4/27/2015 Payables, the 05/01/2015 Payables, and the 05/01/2015 Payroll. (Terry Lundergreen)**

MOTION to approve;

**2d. For possible action. Discussion to approve an Outdoor Festival Permit submitted by the Town of Genoa for the Genoa Americana Celebration, scheduled for July 4, 2015, from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., to be held at the Mormon Station State Park & Town of Genoa, Nevada. (Kathy Lewis)**

MOTION to approve;

**ASSESSOR**

**2e. For possible action. Discussion on approval of the request by the County Assessor to remove unsecured personal property taxes that were determined to be uncollectible for FY2014/15. (Doug Sonnemann)**

MOTION to approve;

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY**

**2f. For possible action. Discussion on approving a professional services agreement with Mark Bruce, Esq. of the Bruce Law Group to provide legal services from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. (Cynthea Gregory)**

MOTION to approve;

**DISTRICT COURT**

**2g. For possible action. Discussion to approve a Substance Abuse and Treatment Agency (SAPTA) sub-grant award for FY14-15 and FY15-16 to the China Spring Youth Camp in the amount of \$169,460, which includes an increase of \$125,000 allocated to FY14-15 and an increase of \$44,460 allocated to FY15-16. (Wendy Garrison)**

MOTION to approve;

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

**2h. For possible action. Discussion to approve an agreement between the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services and China Spring Youth at a total amount not to exceed \$9,000.00 for FY14-15. (Wendy Garrison)**

MOTION to approve;

**COMMUNITY SERVICES**

**2i. For possible action. Discussion on approval of the acceptance of an additional \$25,698 supplement from the Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP) grant funds from Aging and Disability Services Division for reimbursement of food purchased through the Senior Center, Grant Number: 04-000-57-NX-15. (Travis Lee)**

MOTION to approve;

**2j. For possible action. Discussion to approve acceptance of a \$25,000 annual sponsorship from Carson Valley Medical Center to advertise on DART Dial-A-Ride and DART Express vehicles from June 4, 2015 to June 4, 2016. (Travis Lee)**

MOTION to approve;

**PUBLIC WORKS**

**2k. For possible action. Discussion to approve Douglas Disposal, Inc.'s exercise of its option to extend the term of the Solid Waste Franchise Agreement to August 7, 2026.**

MOTION to approve;

**2l. For possible action. Discussion on the adoption of Resolution 2015R-046 to abandon certain assets of the Carson Valley Water Utility consisting of a 300,000 gallon water storage tank, booster pump and fire driver facility and appurtenant equipment located on Minden-Tahoe Airport property. (Carl Ruschmeyer)**

MOTION to approve;

**2m. For possible action. Discussion to approve a First Amendment to the interlocal agreement with Indian Hills General Improvement District (IHGID) for the Vista Grande Enhancement Project (Project) to include the removal and replacement of two waterlines at an approximate cost of \$76,000. A portion of the existing contingency funds for the Project will be used for the costs associated with the waterline improvement, thus the not to exceed amount within the Agreement will not be changed. (Carl Ruschmeyer)**

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

MOTION to approve;

**REPORT OF FEES**

**2n. For possible action. Discussion to approve receipt of the Douglas County Clerk's report of fees for the month of April 2015. (Kathy Lewis)**

MOTION to approve;

**2o. For possible action. Discussion to approve April 30, 2015 Report of Fees from the Recorder's Office. (Karen Ellison)**

MOTION to approve;

**2p. For possible action. Report on general ledger cash balances through May 15, 2015 per NRS 251.030. (Katherine Bradshaw)**

MOTION to approve;

**2q. For possible action. Discussion to approve receipt of Tahoe General Services Report of Revenue and Transactions for the month of April 2015. (Kathy Lewis)**

MOTION to approve;

**2r. For possible action. Discussion to approve receipt of the DMV Report of Revenue and Transactions for the month of April 2015. (Kathy Lewis)**

MOTION to approve;

MOTION; carried unanimously.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

**CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS PULLED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION:**

None.

**COUNTY MANAGER**

**3. Presentation regarding an update on the process to secure passage of the Douglas County Conservation Bill. (Jacques & Dominique Etchegoyhen)**

Jacques and Dominique Etchegoyhen provided an update on the process to secure passage of the Conservation Bill. Mr. D. Etchegoyhen commented at the last update they had informed the Board that the Bill had been introduced in February. In the

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

last couple of weeks they have had some additional movement. On May 21, 2015 before the Senate Energy Natural Resources Committee, specifically the subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests and Mining they had a hearing on the Bill. They submitted their written testimony. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the U.S. Forest Service also provided written and spoken testimony. Timothy Murphy, on behalf of the Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management, made comments. To summarize the comments, the BLM stated it largely supports the conveyances and the conservation goals of Douglas County and they would welcome the opportunity to work with the committee on modifications. Leslie Weldon, Deputy Chief for the National Forest Service, provided comments also reiterating the Forest Service supported the general goals and many of the objectives of Douglas County but they had concerns with how the Bill was drafted and they would like to make some modifications. Mr. D. Etchegoyhen commented many of the challenging issues they face and are trying to overcome is because the Forest Service is unable to meet many of Douglas County's objectives under their existing program.

Mr. D. Etchegoyhen stated next week they are meeting with Senators Heller and Reid's staff to discuss the suggested modifications by the Forest Service so everybody has a full understanding of what they are asking for, what our response is and whether or not those modifications will or will not be included in the Bill.

Commissioner Lynn asked if Mr. D. Etchegoyhen could provide a description of what "modifications" mean and what kind of timeframes. Mr. D. Etchegoyhen responded they hoped to get the Bill marked up or voted out of the committee before the August recess. Then have it on the Senate floor in September or October. They hoped to be paired up at that time with other Bills that have both Republican and Democrat support so the Bill will move through seamlessly. On the House side there have not been any hearings or mark ups on any specific members' Bills. Mr. D. Etchegoyhen commented at the time that such a hearing is permitted Congressman Amodei will seek a hearing and they are hoping the hearing will occur in July and then committee action on the House side to occur in September.

Mr. D. Etchegoyhen went on to describe some of the modifications being requested. They are: if there is a transfer of publicly owned land to the County or Washoe Tribe that the U.S. Government be compensated for the transfers; if there is a transfer of land the Forest Service doesn't want to retain a reversionary interest because that creates a perpetual burden for them to continue to monitor those lands to insure they are being used for public purposes; and issues about reconfiguring some of the parcels that might create for better management. Mr. D. Etchegoyhen explained we now have a concessionaire at Round Hill Pines; this is one of the key components of the Bill, trying to improve the management in the recreation of that parcel. As a result of their efforts the Forest Service has entered into a 20 year Special Use Permit on the land with the opportunity of a 10 year extension. He stated they have achieved

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

their objectives so that section of the Bill will be pulled. He commented the Forest Service is concerned the 30 month timeframe Douglas County has given them to transfer the Dreyfus Estate is too short so discussions will be held on this issue.

Chairman Johnson remarked when you get comments from the BLM and the Forest Service saying “largely or generally supports the goals and objectives” that’s a real positive. He has faith they will be able to work through the issues.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid wanted to know how the U.S. Government expected to be compensated. The land is Forest Service and it has no zoning or land use. Mr. D. Etchegoyhen responded they did not specific state how they expected to be compensated however the speculation is it would be their preference that it goes through a Uniform Federal Appraisal Standard and the recipient pay the value of that land. Congress recognizes we are obtaining these parcels for public use and it is in the publics’ benefit and that Douglas County will be taking on the future management burden of these lands and they won’t require Douglas County compensate the U.S. Government for the lands.

Commissioner Penzel asked if the language regarding reversionary interest is being taken out of the Bill or only out for the Forest Service. Mr. D. Etchegoyhen responded the Forest Service has only made its recommendation regarding those lands that are Forest Service lands so they are not commenting on how the BLM should retain or give up its reversionary interest. He doubts this language or modification will be made in the Senate or the House. If Douglas County was ever to use the lands for a non-public use then the lands would revert back to the U.S. Government.

Commissioner Thaler commented if we were going to hear from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) we would have heard by now and not later. Mr. D. Etchegoyhen responded they have met with the Washoe Tribe to discuss a number of issues and had a positive meeting. The Tribe still wants to obtain the lands that have been identified for transfer to the Washoe Tribe and we are still in agreement to stay within the Cooperative Management Agreement that we arrived at regarding the pit and the area south of the Ranchos.

**EAST FORK BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS**

**4. For possible action. Discussion on approval of the adoption of various job/position descriptions within the East Fork Fire Protection District as prepared and recommended by Pontifex Consulting’s 2014 Wage and Compensation Study. (Chief Tod Carlini)**

District Chief Tod Carlini, East Fork Fire District, explained he was there to secure the Board’s approval off 22 job positions/descriptions that are held within the East

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

Fork Fire Protection District. He provided a summary of the process they went through to get the information to Pontifex Consulting. He explained this will close out the project. They do have one final step and that is to go into the evaluation tool making sure the same components in each job description are represented in the evaluation tool.

No public comment.

MOTION by McDermid/Lynn to approve the adoption of various job/position descriptions within the East Fork Fire Protection District as prepared and recommended by Pontifex Consulting's 2014 Wage and Compensation Study; carried unanimously.

**5. For possible action. Discussion on the approval of the modification in the Fire District's Approved Position List which removes the limit on the number of Firefighter/Paramedic Positions available and to authorize under filling with Firefighter/Advanced EMT positions. (Chief Tod Carlini)**

District Chief Tod Carlini, East Fork Fire District, provided a summary of the Approved Position List and why they are requesting the modification. They are asking for the ability to have more flexibility to bring additional paramedics on when appropriate. They would like to increase the number of Fire Fighter/Paramedics from 26 to 39 and be able to under fill positions with the advance EMTs. They are not adding any new positions. One of their concerns is the City of Reno and some of the other agencies are able to hire additional Fire Fighters and are potentially headed towards more of a Paramedic based type of a service. This would open up opportunities for some of their employees to look at other prospects. He believes having additional paramedics on staff would help save some funds by not having to bring back certain paramedics on an overtime rate.

Commissioner Thaler commented this is a great idea and it's his understanding this is a new trend across the lines. He believes this will give them a lot of flexibility; it will help keep the professional staff here and might even bring people from other agencies to Douglas County. Chief Carlini commented the Board approved a very successful paramedic education program where Advanced EMTs are able to go to paramedic school which they pay for up front and then over a 5 year period the district reimburses them for the cost of the tuition. This would allow them, when they are done with school, to come back and fill, with available funding, a paramedic slot where right now we don't have that capability. Commissioner Thaler then asked if this would give more promotion ability. Chief Carlini responded it could.

No public comment.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

MOTION by Lynn/McDermid to approve the modification in the Fire District's Approved Position List; carried unanimously.

**EAST FORK**

**6. For possible action. Discussion on the adoption of Ordinance 2015-1437 adding Chapter 18.15 – “Ambulance Service Districts” to Title 18 – “Town Annexation and Service Districts” of the Douglas County Code to grant the East Fork Fire Protection District and the Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District the exclusive right to provide ambulance and related advanced emergency medical technician or paramedic care services within their respective district boundaries, and to provide for other properly related matters. (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading) (David Wm. Fogerson)**

Chief David Fogerson, East Fork Fire District, stated nothing has changed since last presented.

Commissioner Penzel stated he still objects to the “exclusivity” part in paragraphs A & B of the Ordinance. He thinks it's inappropriate. He believes there should be some competition.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked Chief Fogerson if the patient is allowed to request what hospital they want to be taken to. Chief Fogerson responded yes, the first choice of hospital destination is the most appropriate for the patient but the patient's choice is always an underlying choice and if the patient chooses to go to another facility other than the one recommended then that is where they are taken.

No public comment.

MOTION by McDermid/Lynn to adopt Ordinance 2015-1437 adding Chapter 18.15 – “Ambulance Service Districts” to Title 18 – “Town Annexation and Service Districts” of the Douglas County Code to grant the East Fork Fire Protection District and the Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District the exclusive right to provide ambulance and related advanced emergency medical technician or paramedic care services within their respective district boundaries, and to provide for other properly related matters; carried unanimously.

*Commissioner Penzel noted for the record his vote was Aye with the exception of paragraphs A & B.*

**PUBLIC WORKS**

**7. Presentation on the Nevada Department of Transportation's draft FY 2016-2025 Work Program for Douglas County and the FY 2016 – FY 2019**

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

**Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Process. (Lee Bonner, NDOT Transportation Multimodal Planning) (Jon Erb)**

Jon Erb, Civil Engineer III, introduced Deputy Director Bill Hoffman and Lee Bonner from NDOT.

Bill Hoffman, Deputy Director of NDOT, introduced his staff and went on to explain how they have reorganized their consultation process. He commented Douglas County staff has been very successful in procuring/securing Federal funds for projects in the area.

Mr. Hoffman provided a list of concerns, issues and needs that came up at the workshop that was held on April 6, 2015. A lot of the talk revolved around safety and making the community more bike and pedestrian friendly. Some of the other issues and concerns were: sidewalk maintenance; impacts of U.S.A. Parkway; congestion/traffic; freight movement; the intersection at Hwy 208 and Hwy 395; converting Centerville Lane into a bike friendly route; and the Cave Rock Tunnel.

Mr. Hoffman discussed NDOT's Zero Fatalities Program; State-wide fatalities by critical emphasis area; safety and the Douglas County 5 year crash map and overview. He provided information on the MAP21 Bill (Federal Funding Bill) which expired May 31, 2015. Congress has extended it until July 31, 2015. It is NDOT's understanding Congress will extend it again until December 31, 2015 while trying to find Federal funding for the Highway Bill. State Highway funding is in good shape. Fuel receipts are up but sometime in the future a new tax funding source will need to be found for the roads. He commented that Douglas County has secured over \$34 million for the FY 16 and FY 17-FY 19. He then provided highlights of the work to be done in Douglas County for FY 16. Mr. Hoffman mentioned the Project Initiation Form; the Transportation Alternative Program; and the Road Relinquishment Program.

Commissioner Lynn asked if the Centerville Lane project would extend down to Dresserlerville. Mr. Hoffman responded yes there is still more work to be done.

Commissioner Penzel asked when a critical emphasis area starts to see an increase in accidents is that when NDOT starts to look at engineering solutions. Mr. Hoffman responded yes they have gone through the entire State looking for substandard pedestrian crossings. Data and statics show it is mostly pedestrian behavior that causes an accident but now they know the statics they can go after a solution. Commissioner Penzel asked if the gas tax is a decreasing tax. Mr. Hoffman responded yes because of inflation and fuel efficient cars. Commissioner Penzel wanted to know where the study of Black Boxes on vehicles to record mileage and tax according to mileage stood. Mr. Hoffman responded there is still research to be done. There are

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

other pilot programs in Oregon, Washington and California they are watching closely. NDOT needs to take that next step and follow in line with the other states but they need to make sure they get this right. Commissioner Penzel brought up going West on Airport Road and turning left onto Hwy 395 is also a dangerous turn and needs to be looked into. Mr. Hoffman responded they will definitely look into that. Commissioner Penzel asked if NDOT was taking over Waterloo and Mottsville roads. Mr. Hoffman responded they have a process for negotiation purposes. Commissioner Penzel's last question was regarding realignment in the Valley and up at the Lake. Mr. Hoffman responded NDOT will discuss bypass solutions after Douglas County has their Connectivity and Transportation Plans done.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid complimented Steve Williams and the road crew that maintain Kingsbury Grade and the roads at the Lake for snow removal. She asked NDOT to not allow private contractors to take on that job. Mr. Hoffman responded NDOT has no plans to outsource winter maintenance. Vice Chairwoman McDermid then mentioned the extreme danger of making a left turn onto Hwy. 395 from Muller Lane. She encouraged NDOT to look at that intersection also. Vice Chairwoman McDermid wanted to see if NDOT and the County could work together on improving Mottsville and Waterloo because of the light on Hwy 88 and the extra traffic the light has caused on those two roads. Vice Chairwoman McDermid expressed her appreciation to NDOT for allowing TRPA to use the area between Hwy. 50 and Hwy. 28 to wash boats before they go onto the Lake. Vice Chairwoman McDermid's last question was regarding any studies that NDOT has done on the traffic going south from the Hwy. 580 completion. Mr. Hoffman responded they have been running all kinds of traffic studies and they have options they are working on.

Commissioner Thaler asked if the crash density map provided by NDOT was accessible by our GIS Department. Mr. Bonner responded yes. Commissioner Thaler then asked why the fuel revenue tax is going up when there are so many more fuel efficient vehicles on the road. Mr. Hoffman believes it's because the economy is coming back and there are more contractors with bigger, older work vehicles on the road. Commissioner Thaler wanted to know if the projects for FY 16 would be completed by the end of FY 16. Mr. Hoffman stated they will be started in FY 16. Commissioner Thaler asked if the over pass that was initially planned at the end of Hwy. 580 would be considered again. Mr. Hoffman responded they do not have the money for the over pass so they are brainstorming to come up with a good alternative. Commissioner Thaler's last question was if there is a nexus between gas taxes and NDOT road project approvals. Mr. Hoffman responded there is a better opportunity to leverage or tie into either State or Federal Gas Tax dollars if you bring money to the table.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid complimented NDOT on saving enough on the Stateline to Stateline bike trail so they can now work on the Laura Drive project.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

Commissioner Thaler asked if the bridge replacement on State Route 756 was a new bridge or a widening of the bridge. Mr. Hoffman responded it is a widening.

Chairman Johnson commented that he hopes the turn lane from Hwy. 208 into Topaz Ranch Estates will be looked at in the future. He thanked NDOT for the Washoe Tribe turn lane on Hwy. 395.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**8. For possible action. Discussion on the adoption of Ordinance 2015-1436 a zoning text amendment to amend Douglas County Code (DCC), Chapter 20.01 by placing a temporary moratorium on Solar Photovoltaic Facilities as a primary use, designating Solar Photovoltaic Facilities as a prohibited use per Title 20 and temporarily prohibiting the County's acceptance and consideration of any and all land use applications, development permits, business license applications, building permit applications and any other application or request to operate or otherwise license or permit any Solar Photovoltaic Facilities; and other properly related matters. (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading) (Hope Sullivan)**

Hope Sullivan, Planning Manager, commented the objective of the Ordinance is to add Section 20.01.120 a moratorium to remain in place for a maximum of 360 days. The intent of this Ordinance is to allow reasonable and responsible amount of time to evaluate the existing regulations governing the Solar Photovoltaic Facilities as a primary use. Staff has made a change to Section 3 to change the number from 180 to 360 per recommendation of the District Attorney's Office and staff is recommending adoption.

Commissioner Penzel commented on Hwy 95 outside of Tonopah there is a solar oil heating facility. It is a 600 foot tower that uses solar mirrors to heat the oil that heats the water to drive the turbines. Does the moratorium cover any kind of solar generating system or is it specifically solar photovoltaic. Ms. Sullivan responded the use that Commissioner Penzel just described is not addressed in the Code and that he brought up a good point that she will need to discuss with the District Attorney's Office.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Carlo Luri wanted to point out a year delay in considering new solar projects will turn away investments and have serious impact on landowners who have a potential to develop solar. He commented these are time sensitive projects and a year will send investment to other counties. He also wanted to point out that 2/3 of California's solar comes from utility scale projects. He feels we are going in the wrong direction.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

Jim Slade commended the Board for implementing the moratorium. He feels further clarification and debate on this contentious issue is needed. We all need to be aware of unintended consequences and the Ordinance needs to be tightened up. He commented part of his concern is the way that staff determines their responses to the required Findings. When the Ordinance came before the Board last year he spoke up and stated he supports renewable and solar energy but he thinks it's important the Ordinance requires a Special Use Permit because there are many places in Douglas County where an industrial scale solar facility would be completely inappropriate. He feels the proponents for the Ordinance having been playing the bait and switch game. At the time the proponents stated the facilities would be located way out towards the Pinenuts, not on irrigated agricultural land or the center of the Valley and never in an area where neighbors would be affected. He urges the Board to tighten up the rules where solar facilities will be allowed.

Public comment closed.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid feels they need to look further at what should be required in order to have solar photovoltaic facilities and if additional criteria needs to be established. If it is the direction of the Country to go to renewable energy then that direction needs to be fully vetted and the correct criteria put in place to ensure it is done where it needs to be done and in the correct way.

MOTION by Lynn/McDermid to adopt Ordinance 2015-1436 based on the ability to make the Findings as identified in the staff report; carried unanimously.

**9. For possible action. Discussion on Appeal (AP) 15-004, an appeal by Franklin "Harry" Ernst of the Planning Commission's decision approving Development Application (DA) 14-047, a Major Design Review for Esplanade at the Ranch located at the southwest corner of Gilman Avenue and Heybourne Road (APN 1320-33-210-069) in the MFR/PD zoning district and within the Minden-Gardnerville Community Plan. The appeal is regarding compliance with the minimum standards for development of the site pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Douglas County Code (DCC), consistency with the Douglas County Design Guidelines for Multi-Family Development, and the safety of the circulation system. (Emery Papp)**

Emery Papp, Senior Planner, provided background on this project and the appeal. He stated there have been seven amendments or modifications to the plan. In 2012 the number of units was increased from 30 to 46. In 2014 the Planning Commissioner denied a variance for RV parking on site. On January 7, 2015 the Town of Gardnerville reviewed and recommended approval and staff approved the Design Review on February 13, 2015. Mr. Papp explained Mr. Ernst filed an appeal on March

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

2, 2015 and on April 14, 2015 the Planning Commissioner reviewed and denied the appeal. Following the Planning Commission's denial Mr. Ernst filed another appeal with the Board of Commissioners being heard at this meeting.

Mr. Papp then explained Mr. Ernst cited nine issues of concern in his Justification Statement to staff. They are: 1) the project doesn't meet the 25% open space rule; 2) centrally located open space has not been met; 3) private road requirement not met; 4) private streets not built to local standards; 5) private streets shall be constructed to County road standards; 6) proposed roads do not conform to Douglas County local road sections; 7) sidewalks are not provided as required; 8) yard setbacks do not meet the minimum standards; and 9) the architecture of the buildings along Concho Drive are monotonous and do not meet County standards.

Mr. Papp responded to each of these concerns. 1) The planned development itself meets the 25% open space requirement for the entire development because of the trails and linkages along the sloughs. On this particular project site the open space is almost 24%. Each unit also has individual private open space. In staff's view because the planned development meets the 25% the onsite open space requirement is also met; 2) The planned development offers a lot of recreational amenities on site – trails and parks. So as a whole the planned development meets the requirement. The proposed onsite amenities include – BBQ & picnic area, gazebo, grass & turf areas for passive play and bicycle parking. There is a requirement for there to be at least one amenity for any multifamily project that provides between 12 and 50 units; 3) These aren't roads going through the site. They have been determined by staff to be access points. Access points are defined in Appendix A of the Douglas County Code as *"the safe, adequate useable ingress or egress to a property for use of not less than 20 feet in width to a legally dedicated way public way."* There are 3 access points, 2 located on Lasso and 1 located off Gilman Ave. The drive isles have been reviewed by East Fork Fire and the Douglas County Engineer and have been determined to be adequate; 4) Cinch Trail and Concho Drive are not deemed private roads therefore they are not held to the same standard or requirements for public or private roads. The maintenance will not be assumed by Douglas County and the drive isles will be maintained in perpetuity by the property owner or a future Homeowners Association; 5) Both drive access ways are not private roads and therefore they are not held to the same standards as County roads. Therefore the subdivision and the map design standards are not applicable; 6) They are not considered private roads and therefore are not required to meet the local standard; 7) The site plan was revised by Staff after Town of Gardnerville looked at it and the revised site plan does include sidewalks on both sides of Cinch Trail and there is a sidewalk on the Southside of Concho Drive. There are also perimeter sidewalks surrounding 3 sides of the property and to the South of the property is the slough; 8) Appendix A defines a setback *"as the distance required that a building, structure, parking or other designated item must be located from a lot line."* This is a one lot parcel with 41 units on it. It is fronting Heybourne;

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

Lasso Lane to the West and Gilman Ave. to the East and all the proposed structures meet the setback requirements from the property lines; and 9) The applicant has provided several different elevations, roof forms, color schemes and orientation of the structures that are in view from the public right-of-way. Internally they might appear monotonous in terms of their setback or orientation but visually they have individual roof elements, color schemes and elevations.

Mr. Papp stated property owners within 600 feet were notified originally when it was approved and then again for the appeal. Mr. Papp provided an aerial view of the neighborhood with the site superimposed; this is the version that was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Town of Gardnerville; a site plan for the project which indicates type of fencing to be used on site which helps the proposed development blend into the built environment; a site plan approved by staff after the Town of Gardnerville with some modifications made: 1) front setback off of Heybourne each one of the structure is at least 10 feet off the property line; 2) the rear setback, each structure is at least 10 feet off the property line; and 3) the side setbacks are all 10 feet from the side property lines and staff requested the removal of parking on Gilman Ave. The applicant relocated the parking internally on the Northside of Concho Drive and as a result the building were pushed north slightly to accommodate the parking spaces. Two other buildings were pushed to the South due to landscaping requirements. That ended up removing driveways for Buildings 1, 3 and 13. In multifamily projects there are no requirements to have driveways but if provided it must meet the 20 foot parking requirement.

Mr. Papp spoke of the consistency with the Design Guidelines. The applicant's concept was to make the units resemble large single family homes. The Development Standards Maximum Density for this site allows up to 46 units. The project proposes 41 units. The applicant has met all the requirements per the Douglas County Code. Mr. Papp provided a streetscape to show what the project will look like once developed. He also provided pictures of the different elevations. All interior access drives will be private; parking on the interior access drives is prohibited; perimeter and internal sidewalks have been provided; line of sight at all entrances has been preserved and staff acknowledges cut through traffic is a possibility however through access is needed for emergency vehicles and refuge pickup.

The staff was able to make all the Findings required for a Major Design Review in the affirmative. Planning Commission also made the same Findings. Staff is recommending the Board affirm the decision of the Planning Commission and deny the appeal approving the Major Design Review for the 41 unit multifamily housing project based on the ability to make all the required Findings for a Major Design Review in the affirmative and the information contained in the staff's report.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked what determines the difference between a private road and an internal access road. Mr. Papp responded you should think of it in terms of a shopping center where you have drive isles of parking on both sides that are required to have 25 feet minimum clearance so you can safely back out and travel through as opposed to a road that is wider and developed to standards. These are a private access drive which means they are intended to serve the traffic interior to the site and not intended for the rest of the neighborhood.

Frank "Harry" Ernst, Appellant. Mr. Ernst provided a brief description of his background and then presented all the Douglas County Code violations he believed were being overlooked. Mr. Ernst provided a summary of his main concerns regarding the open space. He then discussed Division 2 - Street & Traffic of the Douglas County Design Criteria and Improvement Standards; private road requirements; sidewalks requirements; setbacks requirements; Architecture ignores Douglas County Design Criteria and Improvement Standards. In conclusion Mr. Ernst stated the site plan presented is different than what was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Town of Gardnerville and it does not meet the minimum requirements of Douglas County.

Commissioner Thaler asked Mr. Papp if there were other neighborhoods like this in the Minden area. Mr. Papp responded yes there are. One that comes to mind is La Costa. It has similar access as the proposed project. Commissioner Thaler stated he has not been swayed that the Planning Commission, Planning Department and the Town of Gardnerville were wrong in their determinations.

Commissioner Lynn asked Mr. Papp if private roads are required to be built to local road standards. Mr. Papp responded these are not private roads they are access ways. Commissioner Lynn then asked, these are driveways not roads. Mr. Papp responded that is correct.

Commissioner Penzel commented he didn't see the term "monotonous" in the building code but did see "*the plains of the exterior walls should be varied in depth and direction*". From the elevations presented it seemed each one was the same. He did not see a variation in depth or direction. He also sees the issue of safety regarding people walking out into their driveway and he'd like staff to address where the 23% of open space is.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked staff if they had said people who do not live in the development will drive through there. Mr. Papp responded they acknowledge that is a possibility. Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked if the County is being negligent in not having the roadway built to County local road standards. Mr. Papp responded not pursuant to the review by the County and City Traffic Engineers. Vice Chairwoman McDermid stated her concern is if people see that as a road and use it and it's not

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

built to our standards will it cause a problem in terms of maintenance. Mr. Papp responded all lines of sight at all intersections will be maintained so there will be a safe ingress and egress at all access points. The line of sight is conditioned to be preserved. Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked why staff changed the plan that the Town of Gardnerville had approved. Mr. Papp responded they changed it for a couple of reasons; the Town of Gardnerville and staff did not like the parking on Gilman Ave.; and an issue with a required 7 foot landscape strip that was to be located at the Northwest corner Lasso and Heybourne. Staff would not waive that requirement so to be able to keep that landscape strip and accommodate the parking they had to push some of the units northerly which caused them to not be able to meet the 20 foot driveway.

Stephanie Hicks, R.O. Anderson Engineering, provided some background on the intent of the project from the developer's perspective. The developer wanted this project to blend in with the single family residential community. Following approval of the Design Review they will come in with a tentative subdivision map in order to divide the units up into condominiums so they can be sold and individually owned.

Ms. Hicks stated they have worked very hard to bring forth the final design that does meet all the County requirements. They are below the allowed number of units per acre. When the project was originally submitted there was a request for private roads and a request for a variance to the standards that go with a private road. Because of the lack of support for the private roads they were changed to drive isles and the drive isles do meet county standards. They believe the project exceeds open space requirements. There is 15% landscaping required on site and they meet or exceed that. There are no variances proposed with the project at this time. They have incorporated the RV parking that was required. She commented the front doors are actually on the side of the buildings so nobody would be stepping out into the street. She then discussed the different elevations, pop outs and balconies that meet the County Code requirement.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Robert Simpson, resident of the Ranch in Gardnerville, stated he believed all 16 variances had been dropped but it now appears they have been incorporated one way or another. He commented this project originally started with 10 units and then it went to 14. He believes crowding 14 units onto the parcel will be detrimental to the neighborhood. Mr. Simpson stated he had reminded the Board back in September that there has not been a comprehensive review of the Building Codes since 1995 and he wonders if that is leading to the conflict they are having today. He wants to keep the County the most beautiful best kept secret.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

John Smith lives across the street from the project. He believes they are sticking too many units into one spot. You will have the same amount of people; same amount of cars and the same amount of traffic as you have in the rest of the neighborhood. He also thinks the County Code needs to be reviewed and updated.

Jim Slade thinks multifamily units are needed in Douglas County but most people who live in a single family residence don't like multifamily units next door to them. He stated regardless of the fact that multifamily units might be needed it doesn't mean that every application for one has to be approved. He believes this project does not meet the design standards. He wanted to know if the units are individually owned does that change the setback requirements and as for the open space he doesn't see how it's 23% and wanted staff to prove it.

John Martinelli stated he moved here from California to get away from developments like the proposed project. He has concerns that the kids from the area will end up in his driveway.

Clay Hendrix, KDH Builders, commented times have changed. Generation X doesn't want to take care of things, they don't want backyards. He had suggested getting rid of all the variance requests and design the best project they could that would work for everybody. They have worked diligently to do that and it now meets all requirements.

Laurie Simpson commented the County Codes and Master Plan are confusing. She believes there is no way for a citizen, developer or builder to ascertain how to make a decision and they look to the Board for leadership. The Master Plan and the Code should be a bridge that everybody travels across together to come to an understanding to make things better. If it's not working then change it.

Public comment closed.

Commissioner Lynn stated it's not the Building Code that needs to be reviewed it's the Development Code – Title 20. When it was adopted in 1997 it was adopted by a strongly antigrowth Board. He would make the proposed project less dense but it's not their job to redesign this or any other project on the fly particularly since it does meet established code. Commissioner Lynn commented since it is in compliance he is going to have a tough time supporting the appeal.

Chairman Johnson noted for the record that the Board had received some correspondence from Ann Schleigh and Michael Dang both in support of the appeal.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

Commissioner Thaler stated he concurs with everything Commissioner Lynn said. He commented he dealt with the same issue in 2008 with a project on Mahogany Lane in Minden.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid wanted to clarify that the 25% of open space that is required had been met because Ranch at Gardnerville meets the requirement. Mr. Papp responded yes if you take all the open space in the entire planned development it exceeds the 25%.

Hope Sullivan, Planning Manager, stated when they looked at the Ranch at Gardnerville they looked at it as a project and the project had to satisfy the 25% open space. What the Board is seeing is one small section of the overall project. As the project is built out it will yield the 25%.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked if there were any more multifamily developments planned for the Ranch at Gardnerville. Ms. Sullivan responded there are no other multifamily developments. Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked what the rationale was for going from 10 buildings to 14 buildings. Ms. Sullivan responded she has never seen a plan for 10 buildings.

Commissioner Penzel commented this project has changed owners numerous times and each time there is a different twist put on it. The reviews by staff and the Planning Commission are supposed to provide to the Board any deviations that are material to the event. The information that has been presented seems to indicate that staff and the Planning Commission have done their jobs in identifying issues and refuting what Mr. Ernst has present. Commissioner Penzel stated he supports not denying the appeal.

Commissioner Lynn asked what the impact would be on the various code requirements if they end up in individual ownership as condos. Mr. Papp responded there would be no impact as long as it stays as one parcel. They would be subdivided as air space in the units.

Vice Chairwoman asked if they were not to be air space then would you have to look at different standards? She believes they need that verified. Ms. Sullivan responded her understanding, after discussions with the applicant, is they are air space condominiums meaning you own the air space inside your unit. There is no division of the land so without creating new lot line you don't create new setbacks requirements. Vice Chairwoman McDermid stated it's unfortunate to try and fit as much as you can into less than 3 acres under the umbrella of the Ranch at Gardnerville. If the project does meet the Findings then that's what they have to go with. She has confidence in staff that they have vetted this in a way that they would

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

not recommend approval to the Board if they weren't certain the requirements have been met.

Chairman Johnson wanted more clarity on the 25% open space. Mr. Papp responded the onsite open space is 23.64% and in addition to that there is private open space but they did not incorporate that to meet the requirement. Chairman Johnson asked why they tried to reach the 25% in this one space if it was already met by the planned development. Ms. Sullivan responded Dirk Goering originally worked on this and he did look very closely at the open space requirement. There was a discussion on whether this parcel had to reach 25% open space or if the Ranch at Gardnerville as a project covered the 25%.

Commissioner Lynn commented there is no telling where this project will go in the next 30 years but he has to limit his decision to what's presented on the agenda today.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked staff to clarify if the original variances had been dropped or incorporated into the plan. Ms. Sullivan responded the project came in with a lot of variances, it went to the Town of Gardnerville and they were very opposed to the variances. The owner and applicant decided to withdraw the tentative map and the variances and go back to the drawing board. Once they modified the plan they went back to the Town of Gardnerville but it did not comply with County Codes. The plan did morph in order to create County compliance.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked if the Town of Gardnerville ever saw the revised plan. Ms. Sullivan responded it was never referred back to the Town. Staff had the Town's recommendations and staff knew the Town's concerns. Staff did work with the Town Manager to make sure he was aware of it but there was not a referral back to the Town.

Commissioner Thaler commented a complaint that always comes up is things get changed after a Town's approval and he wanted to make sure the Town of Gardnerville is ok with the changes. Ms. Sullivan responded Tom Dallaire, Gardnerville Town Manager, did attend the Planning Commission meeting and said he could not speak for his Board on whether or not they would be supportive of plan as it is right now.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid asked if they could continue this item until the Town of Gardnerville Board had a chance to review and approve the changes. This has gone to the Town of Gardnerville Board twice, first time it was denied and the second time they approved with recommendations but they haven't seen the final product. Ms. Sullivan responded that is correct and she has talked with her staff and told them in

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

the future all code review has to be completed and communicated to the Town Managers & the applicants prior to any Town meetings.

Cynthia Gregory, Deputy District Attorney, stated no there is no requirement that it go back to the Town of Gardnerville. However, Mr. Dallaire was at the Planning Commission meeting and saw the revised plan. He commented he could not speak for his Board but he also didn't request it go back to their Board. The revised plan meets County Code so even if the Town of Gardnerville Board rejected it it still meets County Code.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid stated she thinks it cleaner if it goes back to the Town Board with the changes. Even if it meets County Codes the Town has a right to review it again.

Commissioner Thaler commented he agreed with Vice Chairwoman McDermid but that he knows Mr. Dallaire and if Mr. Dallaire had an issue with the changes he would have gone back to his Board and the Commissioners would have heard from them. He believes that their silence is their approval.

Commissioner Penzel commented he also agreed with Vice Chairwoman McDermid. It takes agreement from everyone to make this a winning situation for everybody. He stated the Development Code is hard to define and Title 20 does need to be worked on. He also believed the revised plan should go back to the Town Board.

MOTION by Lynn/Thaler to affirm the decision of the Planning Commission and deny the appeal opposing the conditional approval of the Major Design Review based on the ability to make all the required Findings per Section 20.614.040 and based on information contained in staff report; Failed - Lynn – Aye; Thaler – Aye; Penzel – Nay; McDermid – Nay and Johnson – Nay. **(Superseded by Commissioner Thaler's Motion below)**

Chairman Johnson asked Ms. Gregory what the next step would be. Does this give them the opportunity to bring it back to the Town Board and the Planning Commission? Ms. Gregory responded no not at this point. What you have is a motion that has failed so you can make another motion to deny or continue the item with regards to taking it back as a courtesy to the Town of Gardnerville.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid commented to Ms. Gregory it was her understanding if the Board didn't affirm the Planning Commission's decision then it went back to the Planning Commission. Ms. Gregory responded no, the Board is the final arbiter.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

MOTION by McDermid to continue this item and in the meantime direct staff to take the project to the Town of Gardnerville and work with the applicant on what was heard today. **(Superseded by Chairman Johnson's Motion below)**

Chairman Johnson stated we can't continue it because we have already denied it.

Ms. Gregory stated your options for a motion are approve, deny, continue or subject to conditions, however they each require an affirmative vote.

The Board took a break so a couple of the commissioners could discuss this with Ms. Gregory.

Chairman Johnson asked Ms. Sullivan if she changed or deleted any recommendations that the Town of Gardnerville saw before the presentation to the Board. Ms. Sullivan responded no. Chairman Johnson asked for further clarification on the entire plan development as it relates to open space. Mimi Moss, Community Development Director, responded the planned development when it was established require 25% of the project area be dedicated as open space. The applicant has exceeded that amount. Along with all the other open space the applicant has included a small park near Buckeye Road which will be built when they get to the future phases. The overall project meets the 25% open space. Montera and La Costa are similar projects that meet the 25% open space for the overall project. Chairman Johnson then asked for clarification on a private road and a drive way. Ms. Moss responded a drive way serves a private development internally, whether it's commercial or residential, it's a drive way that gets you to wherever you need to go internally. And it's for the users within that property. A private road is similar to a public road but the County will not accept it for maintenance. A private road is seen in HOAs that want to gate it to keep people out and the HOA will maintain it themselves.

Commissioner Penzel asked if a private road has to be built to County standards. Ms. Moss responded it has to be built to County standards and it has to come forward to the Planning Commission and Board as part of the project. Private drive ways are done as a Design Review and approved administratively.

MOTION by Johnson/Thaler to reconsider the vote; carried 4 to 1 with Penzel voting Nay.

MOTION by Thaler/Lynn to affirm the decision of the Planning Commission and deny the appeal upholding the conditional approval of the Major Design Review based on the ability to make all the required Findings per Section 20.614.040 and based upon the information contained in staff report and recommend it go for presentation only to the Town of Gardnerville; carried unanimously.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

**10. For possible action. Discussion on the Community Development Department's report on the following development agreements, pursuant to the 24-month review required by Douglas County Code and Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS): Meridian Business Park; Nevada Northwest LLC.; Scotsman Dev. Corp.; Sierra Nevada S.W. Ent., and Virginia Ranch Development Corporation; Park Cattle Company; Romulus Development (Skyline Ranch); and, Sierra Colina. (Mimi Moss)**

*Chairman Johnson disclosed for the record he works on one of the Park properties but didn't feel he needed to abstain because the development agreements were done before he went to work for them.*

Mimi Moss, Community Development Director, stated this is a 24-month review as required by County Code and NRS. Staff is recommending the Board find all the development agreements are in compliance. Ms. Moss provided a brief summary and spoke about any issues with the agreements.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jim Slade didn't understand how the issues with the Meridian Business Park could have been overlooked for so long. He wanted to know if Muller Parkway was all separate development agreements and listed together because they had to do with the same area. He also wanted to know who was going to build H&S's portion of Muller Parkway since they have gone out of business and is there any recourse if it becomes a cost to the Douglas County taxpayers. He made comments regarding Sierra Colina and the items that have been removed from the project. He was curious if the developer of Sierra Colina lost his residential tax credit when he removed the open space from the project.

Public comment closed.

MOTION by Lynn/McDermid to accept the Community Development Department's report on the subject development agreements; carried unanimously.

**PUBLIC WORKS**

**11. For possible action. Discussion on the introduction of Ordinance 2015-1438 amending Douglas County Code Title 20, Appendix D, "Sewer Facilities," Sections 20.D.020 Definitions, 20.D.040 Notices, 20.D.060 Rates and charges, 20.D.070 Rendering and payment of bills, 20.D.100 Inclusion of property into the service area, 20.D.120 Procedures and policies for connection, 20.D.170 Building sewer and connections, 20.D.180 Construction standards for public and private sewers, 20.D.190 Pump stations and force mains, 20.D.200**

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

**Standard details, 20.D.210 Original service area boundaries and providing for other properly related matters (1<sup>ST</sup> Reading). (Carl Ruschmeyer)**

Carl Ruschmeyer, Public Works Director, stated they are making recommendations to various language within the Ordinance and various sections as noted. They don't intend to rewrite the whole Ordinance they are trying to have more clarity and transparency. There are some name and protocol changes. A big issue they have been trying to clear up for years is who owns the service lateral for an individual home. They have added language that states it's the homeowner's responsibility for the maintenance and operation of the sewer lateral. They have removed the Design Standards from the Ordinance because they have a Design Standards Manual. They also wanted to make it clear they do not provide for seasonal shut off. He is recommending introduction of the Ordinance.

No public comment.

Commissioner Penzel has concerns with some of the language in the Ordinance. He has brought them to the County Manager's attention but would like to have a meeting to discuss in more detail.

Commissioner Thaler asked for clarification on the seasonal shut off. He thought it was already being done as a courtesy. Mr. Ruschmeyer clarified they are talking about stopping the billing process for a seasonal shutoff. The County will not stop the billing process. However, they will go out and turn off somebody's water for them if requested.

MOTION by McDermid/Lynn to introduce Ordinance 2015-1438 amending Douglas County Code Title 20, Appendix D, "Sewer Facilities," as presented and this is first reading; carried unanimously.

**12. For possible action. Discussion on the introduction of Ordinance 2015-1439 amending Douglas County Code Title 20, Appendix F, "Water Facilities," Sections 20.F.020 Definitions, 20.F.030 Conditions of service, 20.F.040 Notices, 20.F.070 Basis of billing, 20.F.080 Time and manner of payment, 20.F.100 Service connection and providing for other properly related matters (1<sup>ST</sup> Reading). (Carl Ruschmeyer)**

Carl Ruschmeyer, Public Works Director, stated this is the same as Item 11. They are making recommendations to various language within the Ordinance and various sections as noted. They are trying to have more clarity and transparency. Mr. Ruschmeyer provided a detailed explanation on the billing problems with a single lateral to multiple business or residents. Public Works would also like to set a schedule of fines and penalties for infractions. Right now any infraction is considered

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

a misdemeanor with a potential fine of up to \$1000 a day and 6 months in jail. They believe it would be more effective to have fines that the Public Works Department could impose. Mr. Ruschmeyer is recommending introduction of the ordinance.

No public comment.

MOTION by Lynn/McDermid to introduce ordinance 2015-1439 as presented; carried unanimously.

**COUNTY MANAGER**

**13. For possible action. Discussion and direction to staff regarding legislation or legislative issues proposed by legislators or by other entities permitted by the Nevada State Legislature to submit bill draft requests, or such legislative issues that may impact Douglas County as may be deemed by the Board of County Commissioners.**

Chairman Johnson commented you can go online and search the 78<sup>th</sup> Session or 2015 Session of the Nevada Legislature and they will have a list of all Bills passed but you have to really look to see what or if anything was amended. He has a meeting with NACo. tomorrow to go through all that.

Commissioner Thaler wanted to know if it was part of our Lobbyists' job to provide an overview of all the Bills passed and if it is when will the Board see it.

Vice Chairwoman McDermid stated they will be having their Legislative Coalition Meeting tomorrow. It will be the last one for the session. There will be a report by Steve and Mary Walker at the June 18, 2015 meeting. She wanted to let everybody know that Senator Settlemyer was voted the best Chairman of the 2015 Legislature.

Commissioner Thaler asked that in the future he be kept updated. Chairman Johnson commented they need to figure out a process and streamline it.

James Nichols, County Manager, wanted to point out that even though the Session is wrapping up there are still things going on behind the scenes and not to take the status of a Bill at face value yet. Some things are not final yet.

**14. Reports/updates from County Commission members concerning the various boards and/or commissions that they may be a member of or a liaison to or meetings/functions they have attended. These boards/commissions/meetings include but are not limited to the: Nevada Association of Counties; Carson Water Subconservancy District; Lake Tahoe Visitors Authority; Tahoe Regional Planning Agency; Law Library; NevadaWorks; Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce, Carson Valley Visitors Authority; Tahoe**

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2015

**Douglas Visitors Authority; Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber of Commerce; Western Nevada Development District; Regional Transportation Commission; Nevada Tahoe Conservation District; Nevada V & T Railroad Commission; Joint Powers/Waste Management; Tahoe Transportation District, and the Debt Management Commission. There will be no discussion or action taken on these reports/updates.**

Chairman Johnson commented he went up to Lost Lakes on June 1 and there was no snow.

**CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT (No Action)**

Jim Slade wanted to make some general observations. He believes the Board knows it's best to make decisions with complete information on all issues. He thinks they may be a little too trusting on the information that is provided by staff, the applicant and sometimes the public. He believes there should be some healthy skepticism. He commented staff too often fails to anticipate what should be obvious questions or they don't know the answer so they throw out hunches and responses that don't really answer the question. He used the Esplanade at the Ranch as an explain and how if staff would have been clear at the beginning on how the open space worked then there wouldn't have been so much confusion.

MOTION by Johnson/McDermid to adjourn the meeting; carried unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 6:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

---

Doug N. Johnson, Chairman  
Douglas County Board of Commissioners

ATTEST:

---

Kathy Lewis, Clerk-Treasurer